

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated June 22, 2006, the Examiner states Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are pending, Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are rejected, and Claim 2 is objected to. Additionally, the abstract and the drawings filed on August 21, 2003 and February 11, 2005 were objected to. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the abstract, the claims, and the drawings.

The Applicant has amended the drawings to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(u), and Fig. 3C has been amended to correct the misdirected lead line reference. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant has also amended the abstract of the disclosure to overcome the objection.

The objection to Claim 2 has been overcome by adding language to distinguish the flat elements in Claim 1 from the flat elements in Claim 2.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Robertson (US 2,130,859). Additionally, Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant considers that the amendments to the claims overcome these rejections.

Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to depend on Claim 3; therefore, the 35 USC §112 rejection has been overcome.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to claim that the projections are all in one horizontal plane. Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are being anticipated by Robertson. The invention disclosed in Robertson has an upper wide loop 5 that is not in the same plane as the top and bottom of the narrow loop 6. The loop 5 is lying on top of the loop 6. Additionally, the top and bottom of the narrow loop 6, and the projections, are not in the same horizontal plane. In contrast, the present application discloses two projections that are in one horizontal plane. Furthermore, even if the top and bottom of the narrow loop 6 in Robertson could be compared to the projections of Claim 1, the upper wide

loop 5 and the vertical downward portion cannot be compared to the element forming the right angle of Claim 1, formed by portions 7 and 8 (fig. 1).

Independent Claim 1 also claims each flat part, is integral with the projections. Robertson does not disclose this feature. Rather, Robertson discloses loop 5, which is not in the same plane as loop 6, lying on top of loop 6.

Furthermore, independent Claim 1 has been amended to claim that the projections mesh together. The invention disclosed in Robertson does not have a center plane having similar meshing projections; and therefore, the present application discloses an entirely different invention.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

October 23, 2006

Date

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613